Our Stake in Algerian Peace, P. 3

A Glimpse of The "Evidence" of Aggression Being Used in Laos, See Page Four

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 37 OCTOBER 5, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

From Rigid Hostility to Rigid Friendship

What we have been seeing is an extraordinary example of leadership in its most elementary form. We had been marching in one direction and we are now marching in another. With Mr. Eisenhower at our head we had been proceeding on the assumption that the world was menaced by a diabolic conspiracy run from Moscow, and that our own safety lay in piling up an ever larger supply of ever more destructive arms. With Mr. Eisenhower at our head we have now executed an about face and are proceeding on the assumption that the Russians want peace as much as we do, and that we must slowly by patient negotiation disentangle the issues which hinder peaceful co-existence. Quite suddenly peace has become a respectable word again.

No Agreement on Anything Specific

This momentous change is the more striking inasmuch as in other ways nothing has changed at all. One searches the joint communique which ended the Eisenhower-Khrushchev visit in vain for any sign of any agreement on any specific question. On disarmament, all the American President and the Soviet Premier could agree on was a pledge "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution"; on Germany, "the positions of both sides were expounded"; on Berlin, they will resume negotiations; on trade, there were discussions but they drew a blank; with respect to "an exchange of persons and ideas" certain agreements are "expected" (as they had been for some time) "in the near future." Of nuclear matters, either with respect to cessation of testing or cooperation for peaceful purposes, there was no mention. There was agreement only "that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiation." Beyond this generality they were unable to go.

But the atmosphere miraculously has been changed. Before they were rigidly hostile. Now they are, so to speak, rigidly friendly.

The rigidity extends so far that Mr. Khrushchev really did not go beyond Mr. Gromyko's previous assurances at Geneva that in reopening the Berlin question, Moscow was in no sense laying down an ultimatum, or setting a fixed deadline. The President had hoped to get Khrushchev to agree that Allied rights in Berlin would continue until a change could be negotiated. All he got and this not until the final talks on Sunday was an oral agreement allowing Mr. Eisenhower to state that there was no fixed time limit on the talks. Even on this there was a subtle but unmistakable difference in emphasis between the way the President stated this agreement at press conference and the way the Soviet Premier confirmed it next day in Moscow. Mr. Eisenhower said they agreed that while negotiations on Berlin "should not be prolonged indefinitely . . . there could be no fixed time limit on them." In Moscow, where Tass dutifully omitted this from its summary of the Eisenhower press conference until it could check with the boss, Mr. Khrushchev said they agreed that in resuming negotiations "a restricted period of time cannot be given but that on the other hand they must not be drawn out indefinitely." One emphasized the lack of a time limit, the other that the talks must not be dragged out indefinitely. This still leaves it clear that if no new status for West Berlin is negotiated, the Soviet Union intends to take action on its own in a separate treaty with East Germany. The carrot is small and the stick almost invisible but still there. Neither side really budged.

Speaking of Freedom of Communication

The Associated Press ticker reported from Moscow Sept. 24 that the Soviet physicist Dmitri Skobeltsyn had been refused a visa to the United States. Skobeltsyn is director of the Soviet Physics Institute and also chairman of the committee which awards the Lenin Peace Prizes. He wanted to come here in order to confer the prize on Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, founder of the NAACP, next to Paul Robeson the American Negro most famous abroad, and like him a Soviet sympathizer. "American authorities said," the AP reported, "there was no objection to Skobeltsyn personally, but that the purpose of his trip was not approved."

We recall the avalanche of disapproving editorials in the American press when the Soviet government blocked the award of the Nobel prize to Pasternak because it didn't like his political views, and the more recent chorus during the Khrushchev trip on the wickedness of censorship and Iron Curtains. We're listening hard for a roar of protest against this interference by the State Department with freedom to travel and freedom of ideas. So far we haven't caught a beep.

The Difference Is In The Smiles

Certainly on the crucial question of Germany, Mr. Khrushchev differs little if any from Mr. Molotov and Mr. Eisenhower little if any from Mr. Truman. The difference is that both men emerged from Camp David not only smiling but apparently in genuine friendliness—and the vast propaganda apparatus at the command of both men in their respective countries is signalling friendship. This is to the good, but signals can be reversed if the better atmosphere does not yield concrete agreements.

What gives one hope is that this signal finds a willing audience on both sides. In a sense Mr. Khrushchev by his whistle-stop tour of America won an election in Russia. His trip here, his reception, the buildup in the Soviet press, solidified his position at home. We have made him unmistakably Moscow's No. 1 man at last. Peace is popular in the Soviet Union, and in this he embodies the deepest longings of the Soviet people. The picture here is not so simple. There

(*Continued on Page Two*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How the Democrats (If They Dare) Might Win the 1960 Elections

(*Continued from Page One*)

exist pressure groups here advancing policies which could lead only to war, yet the Gallup poll showed that only 19 percent of our people disapproved of the Khrushchev visit and there is political timing in postponing Mr. Eisenhower's return trip until next May or June, on the threshold of the 1960 elections. It was the cutest press agentry in years to blame this postponement on the grandchildren; they may not grow up under communism, as Khrushchev predicted, but it looks as if they may live four more years under Republicanism.

The Providential Dialectic

Co-existence has moved so far along in recent weeks that each side's political campaigns suddenly seem now to be waged on the other's territory. Just as Khrushchev solidified himself at home by his successful tour here, so Eisenhower is likely to win the U. S. election by barnstorming the Soviet Union next spring. Even if the results again are mainly atmospheric, they will sharpen the image of his party as the party of peace and prosperity. While the Communists here still want to work within the Democratic party, Mr. Khrushchev is going to make it very difficult for the Democrats to win next year. Such, his comrades may well muse, is the mysterious way the dialectic moves its wonders to perform.

The exchange of visits, that ice-breaking for which we are thankful to both men, will reshape our politics in many ways if no upset intervenes. It will make Nixon the candidate of the Republicans as the heir of Eisenhower and his advance scout in Moscow. It will smother the hopes of Rockefeller, who belongs with George Meany, Cardinal Spellman and the cold war Democrats. It may make Adlai Stevenson, the only top echelon Democrat to welcome Khrushchev and support Eisenhower, the Democratic nominee again. For the Democrats will need a man who can compete as a symbol of peace and who has broken with the stale stereotypes of Truman and Acheson. Humphrey is the only other choice in this respect, but Adlai outranks him in age and fame and the promise of being able to carry the conservatives of the party along with him.

If Ike, who began by making peace in Korea ends by making peace with Russia, the Democrats must change their cold war tune. A worthy new score could be composed, if they have the courage to sing it. Only a conservative and a general could really make a settlement with Russia; this much is true. But once that peace is made only a liberal Democrat, in the tradition of FDR, can do the job of successfully substituting ploughshares production for armament. Only the Democrats can move toward that pragmatic combination of free enterprise with economic planning which is essential to assure America's growth in coming years.

Each side, in the great Russo-American race, fears what is genuine in the other. Our Republicans fear economic planning. Russia's stuffy new managerial class with its bourgeois outlook fears the fresh winds of free ideas. For all foxy Grandpa Khrushchev's boasting in that glamorized farewell TV version of the Soviet system, they're so unsure of themselves they're frightened of free competition in ideas. The printed word is still the weapon they fear most. Their workers' state gives the worker very little in the way of rights against his bosses; they fear uncensored comparison. I have seen the Soviet Union and—peace to the shade of John Reed, who died before he could be disillusioned—it is *not* the future. Our Republicans, on the other hand, showed their bankruptcy in the thirties when FDR demonstrated that we could make democracy work to satisfy the aspirations of worker and farmer. We have nothing to fear from peaceful coexistence, but the road to it will bring a similar challenge and in meeting it we can again demonstrate our country's greatness.

Monkish Murder in the Holy Island of Ceylon

A Trendex poll finds few Americans believe in the possibility of an arms agreement with Moscow. "Many, in holding the Russians untrustworthy," the pollsters reported (Wash. Star, Sept. 27), "mentioned their lack of religion." This curious American myth, which seems to imply that war ended with the coming of Christ and resumed again with the foundation of the Third International, is probably as impervious to facts as most superstitions. Otherwise one might hope that the bullet which killed Ceylon's Premier would help to dissipate it. The assassination is nevertheless worth a moment's reflection.

The Indian religions are even more peaceful in their teaching than Christianity. Hinduism goes far beyond the Gospel in preaching non-violence; the doctrine of ahimsa forbids the killing of an insect; yet a Hindu felt so deeply about its teaching that he murdered Gandhi, who dared treat Muslims kindly as well as cockroaches. Buddhism is more pacifist than Hinduism, and more tolerant. But Bandaranaike was the victim of a Buddhist monk. For some time the most devout of the Buddhists have wanted to end secular government in Ceylon and make the holy island where Buddha rested an uncomfortable place for non-Buddhists to tarry.

On the basis of the evidence, extending over many centuries, it would be logical for the Russian Communists to doubt whether a trustworthy arms agreement could be reached with us because we are religious, and religion so often makes men cruel and treacherous.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF I. F. Stone's Weekly published 48 times a year at Washington, D. C. for 1959. 1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor, I. F. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.; Business Manager Esther M. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W. Washington, D. C. 2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) I. F. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. Esther M. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. Celia M. Gilbert, Cambridge, Mass. Jeremy J. Stone, Menlo Park, Calif. Christopher D. Stone, New Haven, Conn. 3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: none. 4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner. 5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly and triweekly newspapers only.) 11,081. Signed, I. F. Stone. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of September 1959. Alvin Bernstein, Notary Public, Washington, D. C. (My commission expires 7-31-1962.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America's Stake in Seeing Peaceful Negotiation Over Algeria

The Algerian rebel government has answered de Gaulle's initiative in statesmanlike fashion. The Provisional government does not ask recognition by France as the government of Algeria, but it does ask for recognition of the inescapable fact that it speaks for the rebels and that peace cannot be obtained without talks between it and Paris. "Peace could be immediate," Premier Ferhat Abbas declared in his formal statement in Tunis and his government is ready "to discuss the political and military conditions of a cease-fire and the conditions and guarantees of the application of self-determination."

The dialogue has begun, as those in France who have shown themselves most sympathetic to the Algerians had hoped. In *France-Observateur* (Sept. 24) just before the Algerian reply, Claude Bourdet, long the champion of justice for the North Africans, hoped M. Abbas and his colleagues would be wise enough to seize on de Gaulle's recognition of Algeria's right to self-determination.

The principle having been accepted by both sides, two questions follow and the rebels raise them. There must be a free vote, and a free vote is impossible if the elections are to be run by the French army. Secondly, self-determination, the rebels says, cannot be used to break up Algeria "into racial or religious communities," destroying its national entity. Nor can Algeria's greatest resource, Saharan oil, be mortgaged in advance to France; the rebels demand a chance to participate in its development by "wise and fruitful cooperation." It also is not self-determination for Algeria if subject to confirmation by a referendum in France. Even so skillful a player as de Gaulle will be hard put to parry these moves.

Few Americans realize the stake we have in the success of these efforts. Their failure will endanger world peace. Too few have noticed the growing ties between the Algerian rebels and Peking. If the war flares up, Communist China will make itself felt for the first time in a crucial struggle in the West and draw the American government in on the undemocratic and colonial side. It would be better and cheaper now, by a discreet offer of financial aid in the gigantic task of raising Algeria from poverty, to facilitate a settlement while moderates are still at the rebel helm.

Iron Curtain Bulletin

At the end of the first round in what will be an historic test case, Federal District Judge McGuire ruled here last week that the State Department had a right to bar Congressman Charles O. Porter (D. Ore.) from travel in Communist China. The Judge declared that since the Congressman had no special authorization for the trip from Congress or one of its committees, his status was no different from that of an ordinary citizen. If there had been such special authorization, the Judge added, "It might be a different story, but even then I would doubt it." This would allow the executive branch not only to make foreign policy but to shut off members of Congress from first-hand contact with the facts on which policy was made. This merges into fantasy when it becomes a question of the State Department's insistence on acting as if the largest country in the world did not exist, and the greatest revolution of our times had never happened.

On Meany's Clash With Randolph

Three points stand out for us in the battle between George Meany and A. Philip Randolph at the close of the AFL-CIO Convention. Like a flash of lightning, it threw a vivid light on certain realities in the labor movement which people left-of-centre would rather not talk about. The first is that Meany has a bad case of what the Russians call personality cult, and few dare talk back to him at Council meetings. The second is that while the AFL-CIO, as a matter of policy, expels unions when they vote for men with pro-Communist leanings, and (under pressure) sometimes tosses out corruptionists, it does not regard racialism as an offense. Lily-white unions which bar Negroes are tacitly favored and Jim Crow unions established by Negroes in self-defense are fostered. When Randolph, of the Sleeping Car Porters, wanted to know why the AFL-CIO took one attitude toward Communists and corruptionists and another toward racists, Meany had no answer but abuse and only one non-Negro leader voted for Randolph's motion to make the railroad brotherhoods begin to admit Negroes. The third point is that nothing could be worse, for a world facing a new wave of racialist poison from both sides in Africa, than the failure of whites to practice brotherhood even in the trade-union movement. This is, of course, an old story but we cannot afford a fresh retelling.

A Voice from the Past Challenges Mr. K on A Key Episode in U. S.-Soviet Relations

"Mr. Khrushchev at Los Angeles stated: 'American soldiers went onto our soil, headed by their generals, to help our White Guard combat the revolution. . . . The British, all the capitalist countries of Europe and America, marched upon our country to strangle the new revolution. . . . Yet we routed those who attacked us and threw them into the sea.'

"This is completely false. The fact is that the Chief of Staff of the U. S. Army violently opposed this expedition, but President Wilson bowed to the allied request. This expedition was commanded by Gen. William S. Graves. . . . The American troops at no time fought against the Reds, Whites or other factions. . . . The American forces numbered 7,000 and were not pushed into the sea, but left voluntarily.

"Gen Graves in his book, 'America's Siberian Adventure,' tells all the facts and the Soviet government was so pleased with the account that they sent him a nice check for use of the book. This astonished General Graves, since it is well known that the Soviets pirate anything they please and never pay royalties to anyone. . . ."

—Letter by Cora March, widow of Gen. Peyton C. March, U. S. Army Chief of Staff, World War I, Wash. Star, Sept. 24.

Gen. Graves had to fight a rearguard action against the British, the Japanese and the State Department. The State Department wanted to back Kolchak, of whom Gen. Graves took the dim view that "at no time while I was in Siberia was there enough popular support behind Kolchak . . . to have lasted one month if all Allied supports had been removed." (*America's Siberian Adventure*, p. 157). Gen. March supported Gen. Graves in his attitude of strict neutrality. President Wilson's role in the intervention was equivocal. The presence of our troops blocked Japanese ambitions in Siberia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can Failure to Say "Thank You" for Flowers Be Used as Evidence of Aggression?

SEATO Foreign Ministers At Washington Meeting Downgrade Laos Crisis

There are welcome signs that the Laos crisis is being downgraded. The special meeting of the SEATO Foreign Ministers in Washington last Monday ended after three hours with a remarkably calm and non-committal communique. The Foreign Ministers made it appear that they discussed "a wide range of topics" among which was "the current situation in Laos." They fully supported "the prompt action of the United Nations Security Council." There was no reference to foreign aggression or intervention.

A Sudden Outburst of Restraint

The Washington communique in its astringent and restrained tone contrasted sharply with the communique issued 48 hours earlier in Bangkok at the close of a SEATO council on the Ambassadorial level. This said SEATO had taken steps to act promptly "in the event of it becoming necessary to defend the integrity of Laos against outside intervention." The diplomatic correspondent of the *London Observer* (Sept. 27) interpreted the Bangkok statement as taking Britain, which is of course on the SEATO Council, "a small but perceptible step nearer direct military involvement in Laos."

At the State Department, however, it was denied after the SEATO Foreign Ministers meeting that there had been any discussion here of military intervention. It was even said that Laos came up only as part of a brief historical review of the situation in the Far East. The word military, we were told, had not even been mentioned. To believe the official explanation, the Foreign Ministers of SEATO had met only for a kind of glorified "bull session" on world affairs.

It looks as if the UN investigating team may serve the useful purpose of giving Laos and the U. S. military there a face-saving way out by claiming that, with the arrival of UN investigators, intervention stopped.

In the meantime the search for evidence of invasion goes on. Richard Dudman, in a vivid series of deeply skeptical reports from the "battlefront" to the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch,* provided two piquant samples of this evidence in a cable printed by his paper Sept. 22.

In one case six rusty flintlocks were being loaded at Sam Teu for shipment as evidence to Vientiane where the UN investigators were waiting. "The flintlocks," Dudman reported, "were said to be weapons of rebel Meo tribesmen." Since there are Meos on both sides of the Laotian-North Vietnamese border, it is hard to be sure what the flintlocks prove.

Dudman also reported that when the commander at Sam Teu was asked for proof of foreign invasion he said villagers at Oantlo, ten miles away, had seen 15 Viet Namese. He explained "that the village girls had offered flowers to the strangers" and "since the men did not thank them or say a single word, the villagers concluded they could not speak Laotian and must be North Viet Namese."

Or maybe they were just impolite.

As We Were Saying, Let's Stop Mixing Politics With Science

New York, Sept. 25—Red China already could have her own A-bombs. Her leaders might make this stunning announcement or stage a nuclear test October 1, when China celebrates the 10th anniversary of Communist rule. 'It wouldn't surprise me if China could now make a small number of crude bombs,' says one famous U. S. scientist who played a leading role in creating America's first A-bombs. . . . All scientists surveyed stress that China is embarking on a tremendous program of training scientists . . . using science as a major springboard for her 'great leap forward'."

—Alton Blakeslee, Associated Press science writer, Washington Evening Star, Sept. 25.

Vienna, Sept. 25 (AP)—The International Atomic Energy Authority rejected a Soviet-sponsored bid by Communist China to gain membership in the atoms-for-peace organization. By a 30-20 vote, delegates to the IAEA's third general conference adopted a U. S. resolution to disregard any proposals for admission of Red China . . . following a spirited discussion in which Paul F. Foster, U. S. chief delegate, urged the Soviet Union to clear the way for IAEA to pursue its scientific and technical work and stop mixing political strife into the agency's scientific activities."

—Same paper, same day.

Give A Gift Sub to A College Student—A Widening Circle Now Reads and Likes the Weekly

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/5/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I.F.Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED